



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,044	04/02/2004	Jen-Hwang Weng	BHT-3167-186	9618
7590 06/15/2007				
BRUCE H. TROXELL SUITE 1404 5205 LEESBURG PIKE FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041			EXAMINER FATEHI, PARHAM R	
			ART UNIT 2194	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/15/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/816,044	Applicant(s) WENG ET AL.	
	Examiner Parham (Paul) R. Fatehi	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/2/2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Par 3, ln 1 recites "user manipulate digital content" and should be changed to "user manipulates digital content".
 - Par 3, ln 2 recites "the user have to" and should be changed to "the user has to".
 - Par 5, ln 7 recites "different to" and should be changed to "different than".
 - Par 5, ln 8 recites "cause the the driver program unable to drive" and should be changed to "the driver program to be unable to drive".
 - Par 6, ln 4 recites "invention is to trigger" and should be changed to "invention is intended to trigger".
 - Par 6, ln 4 recites "behaviors being triggered" and should be changed to "behaviors were triggered".
 - Par 6, ln 5 recites "care the location" and should be changed to "care about the location".
 - Par 7, ln 1-2 recites "Because... response" and is a sentence fragment.
 - Par 7, ln 5 recites "properly response the event" and should be changed to "properly respond to the event".
 - Par 7, ln 6 recites "being triggered" and should be changed to "is being triggered".
 - Par 7, ln 12 recites "user can arbitrarily stops" and should be changed to "user can arbitrarily stop".
 - Par 7, ln 15 recites "from the where" and should be changed to "from where".
 - Par 7, ln 17 recites "the user stop" and should be changed to "the user stops".

Art Unit: 2194

- Par 8, ln 1 recites “from where user stop” and should be changed to “from where the user stops”.
- Par 8, ln 2 recites “utilize broadly” and should be changed to “utilized broadly”.
- Par 8, ln 4 recites “manipulate” and should be changed to “manipulating”.
- Par 8, ln 8 recites “When” and should be changed to “When it”.
- Par 8, ln 10 recites “user stop playing” and should be changed to “user stops playing”.
- Par 8, ln 10 recites “user stop are all triggered” and should be changed to “user stops are all triggered”.
- Par 8, ln 11 recites “user stop won’t be distort” and should be changed to “user stops won’t be distorted”.
- Par 9, ln 4 recites “but not shows” and should be changed to “but does not show”.
- Par 10, ln 1-2 “When... boring” is worded poorly and should be rephrased.
- Par 11, ln 9 recites “where the user stop” and should be changed to “where the user stops”.
- Par 13, ln 1 recites “paly” and should be changed to “play”.
- Pg 21, ln 1 recites “eediting” and should be changed to “editing”.
- Pg 21, ln 4 recites “manipulating a digital content” and should be changed to “manipulating digital content”.
- Pg 21, ln 12 recites “object-brhaviors” and should be changed to “object-behaviors”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 1, 3, 4, 10 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- Claim 1 recites "A method to manipulating a digital content" and should be changed to "A method for manipulating digital content".
- Claim 3 recites "the behavior is selected at least one from a group" and should be rephrased.
- Claim 4 recites "stopping... sequence" and has awkward phraseology and should be rephrased.
- Claim 10, In 5 recites "a center process unit" and should be changed to "a central processing unit".
- Claim 13 recites "center process unit" and should be changed to "central processing unit".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 19-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, specifically, as directed to an abstract idea. Claims 19-27 recite "A website system". Such limitation as claimed is directed to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art which would produce a concrete and useful result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3-5, 10-14 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being disclosed by Sobeski et Al (US 6,795,968 B1) [hereafter Sobeski].

As per Claim 1, Sobeski discloses: **A method to manipulating a digital content which comprises a plurality of object-behaviors, the method at least comprising steps of: 1) providing a behavior sequence which is an order of the object-behaviors being triggered; and 2) triggering the object-behaviors in a proper order based on the behavior sequence** (col. 1, ln 43-62, digital content is manipulated based on an order of object behavior sequences where such object-behaviors are triggered)

As per Claim 3, Sobeski discloses: **The behavior is selected at least one from a group consisting of an event, a method and a property** (col. 1, ln 28-36, behavior is selected from group of event methods [inherently includes property])

As per Claim 4, Sobeski discloses: **1) stopping trigger the object-behaviors during implementing the behavior sequence; and** (col. 4, ln 59-62, when an object-behavior is triggered it can determine that not all behaviors must be included, thereby stopping those that are not to be included) **2) triggering a specific object-behavior of**

the digital content by a input device (col. 4, ln 59-62, triggering instantiates specific behaviors [inherently means that all behaviors may not be included or triggered if desired] and col. 2, ln 40-48, sending commands to the input device)

As per Claim 5, Sobeski discloses: **implementing the specific object-behavior and canceling implementing the behavior sequence** (col. 4, ln 59-62, when an object-behavior is triggered it can determine that not all behaviors must be included, thereby stopping those that are not to be included)

As per Claim 10, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 1 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 11, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 3 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 12, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 4 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 13, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 5 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 14, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 6 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 19, Sobeski discloses: **A website system for manipulating a digital content in a client computer, the digital content comprising a plurality of object-behaviors, the website system at least comprising: 1)a communication interface for setting up a communication link with the client computer; 2) a memory, for storing the digital content and a behavior sequence which is an**

order of the object-behaviors being triggered, the digital content and the behavior sequence downloading to the client computer via the communication link through the communication interface; and 3) a behavior playing mechanism which is downloaded to the client computer via the communication link through the communication interface, for triggering the object-behaviors in a proper order based on the behavior sequence (col. 5, ln 20, a website system, col. 4, ln 59-62, when an object-behavior is triggered it can determine that not all behaviors must be included, thereby stopping those that are not to be included triggering instantiates specific behaviors and col. 2, ln 40-48, sending commands to the input device, all components in a computer system with memory and communication set-up [a communication link via a communication interface] and the playing behavior of object sequence is downloaded client computer)

As per Claim 20, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 3 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 21, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 4 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 22, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 5 and is rejected under the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2194

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2, 6-9, 15-18 and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sobeski in view of Hines (US 2003/0121027).

As per Claim 2, Sobeski discloses the limitations as claimed above. However, Sobeski does not explicitly disclose: **the behavior sequence comprises a plurality of information, each information comprises an identification data and an activating time of each object-behavior**

On the other hand, Hines explicitly discloses that the behavior sequence comprises a plurality of information, each comprising an identification data and an activating time of each object-behavior (see Par. 663, In 1-9, behavioral automata... space [identification] / time diagrams & Fig. 64 #6408, where b is activation edge and B is identification data & Par. 20, In 3-4, the information contains data which identifies object and, Par. 197, In 1-8, activation edge is signified by the information bit). Hines teaches that his method of behavioral abstraction fills a need for prior designs and programming methodologies that were developed without consideration for debugging techniques. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it motivated to modify the system of *dynamic object behavior* of Sobeski with the method of *behavioral abstraction* of Hines in order to enhance the design and reduce the implementation time of Sobeski's software system (since debugging consumes the majority of the design time in a software system).

As per Claim 6, Sobeski discloses the limitations as claimed above. However, Sobeski does not explicitly disclose: **providing a visible indicating object to indicate the object-behavior being triggered at time during triggering the object-behaviors in a proper order.**

On the other hand, Hines discloses providing a visible indicating object to indicate the object-behavior being triggered at time during triggering the object-behaviors in a proper order (Par. 288, In 1-11, visible message ports/objects indicators indicating triggering occurs in proper order, "data from triggers" & par. 506, "visual prototype of a behavior"). Hines teaches that his method of behavioral abstraction fills a need for prior designs and programming methodologies that were developed without consideration for debugging techniques. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it motivated to modify the system of *dynamic object behavior* of Sobeski with the method of *behavioral abstraction* of Hines in order to enhance the design and reduce the implementation time of Sobeski's software system (since debugging consumes the majority of the design time in a software system).

As per Claim 7, Sobeski discloses the limitations as discussed above. Sobeski, however, does not explicitly disclose: **playing the voice data during triggering the object-behaviors in a proper order.**

On the other hand, Hines discloses playing voice data during triggering the object-behaviors in a proper order (par. 548, In 1-9, voice data... triggering). Hines teaches that his method of behavioral abstraction fills a need for prior designs and programming methodologies that were developed without consideration for debugging

Art Unit: 2194

techniques. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it motivated to modify the system of *dynamic object behavior* of Sobeski with the method of *behavioral abstraction* of Hines in order to enhance the design and reduce the implementation time of Sobeski's software system (since debugging consumes the majority of the design time in a software system).

As per Claim 8, Sobeski discloses the limitations as discussed above. Sobeski, however, does not explicitly disclose: **editing the behavior sequences**.

On the other hand, Hines discloses editing the behavior sequences (Par. 605, In 1-3, editing the behavior). Hines teaches that his method of behavioral abstraction fills a need for prior designs and programming methodologies that were developed without consideration for debugging techniques. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it motivated to modify the system of *dynamic object behavior* of Sobeski with the method of *behavioral abstraction* of Hines in order to enhance the design and reduce the implementation time of Sobeski's software system (since debugging consumes the majority of the design time in a software system).

As per Claim 9, Sobeski discloses the limitations as discussed above. Sobeski, however, does not explicitly disclose: **recording the behavior sequence**.

Hines, on the other hand, discloses recording the behavior sequence (Par. 400, In 1-6, recording the behavior order). Hines teaches that his method of behavioral abstraction fills a need for prior designs and programming methodologies that were developed without consideration for debugging techniques. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it motivated to modify the

system of *dynamic object behavior* of Sobeski with the method of *behavioral abstraction* of Hines in order to enhance the design and reduce the implementation time of Sobeski's software system (since debugging consumes the majority of the design time in a software system).

As per Claim 15, it is a system claim with the same limitations as the method in claim 7 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 16, Sobeski discloses: **Using the input device** (col. 4, ln 59-62, triggering instantiates specific behaviors and col. 2, ln 40-48, sending commands to the input device). Sobeski, however, does not explicitly disclose: **stores a voice editing mechanism to edit the behavior sequence.**

On the other hand, Hines discloses storing a voice editing mechanism to edit the behavior sequence (Par. 605, ln 1-3, an editing mechanism for Par. 548, ln 1-9, voice data for purposes of storing). Hines teaches that his method of behavioral abstraction fills a need for prior designs and programming methodologies that were developed without consideration for debugging techniques. One having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it motivated to modify the system of *dynamic object behavior* of Sobeski with the method of *behavioral abstraction* of Hines in order to enhance the design and reduce the implementation time of Sobeski's software system (since debugging consumes the majority of the design time in a software system).

As per Claim 17, it is a system claim with the same limitations as claim 9 and is rejected under the same reasons.

Art Unit: 2194

As per Claim 18, it is a system claim with the same limitations as claim 2 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 23, it is a system claim with the same limitations as claim 6 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 24, it is a system claim with the same limitations as claim 7 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 25, it is a system claim with the same limitations as claim 8 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 26, it is a system claim with the same limitations as claim 9 and is rejected under the same reasons.

As per Claim 27, it is a system claim with the same limitations as claim 2 and is rejected under the same reasons.

Conclusion


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Parham (Paul) R. Fatehi whose telephone number is 571-270-1407. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30AM-5PM EST, off alternate Fridays.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571)272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2194

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Fatehi
AU 2194

06/06/2007



WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER